

City of Burien, Washington

Shoreline Advisory Committee

Meeting #7 Summary

October 7, 2009

4:00pm

(1) ATTENDANCE

SAC Members present	Technical Staff Present	Interested Parties Present
Jim Branson Cyrilla Cook Joe Fitzgibbon Patrick Haugen Lee Moyer Don Warren	David Johanson Bob Fritzen Liz Ockwell Steve Roemer Karen Stewart	Chestine Edgar Robert Edgar Robert Howell Susan Luthy Kathi Skarbo

(2) CONFIRM AGENDA

1. The agenda was confirmed

(3) REVIEW AND APPROVE MEETING #6 SUMMARY

1. There was consensus that the meeting summary was accepted as presented with the following corrections:
 - There were two people missing from the Interested Parties Present List: Bud Mount and Terry Lee.
 - A typo was found on page 2 in the 3rd paragraph. The sentence should read: He wanted to ensure that the ~~committee~~ committee doesn't feel rushed.

- (4) **SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM UPDATE, PROGRESS REPORT AND RECAP:** David Johanson briefly stated where the committee is in the review of the shoreline master program. He passed around comments submitted by the committee prior to this meeting. Comments from the committee members were summarized in one document to help with organization of review.

- (5) **SHORELINE USES AND MODIFICATIONS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS, CHAPTER IV:** Pat Haugen led the continued discussion of Chapter IV.

1. 20.30.040 Shoreline Vegetation Conservation

- Cyrilla Cook asked for clarification on section 2.c.v regarding the meaning of 'non-compliant'. David Johanson responded that the term 'non-compliant' was used to recognize buffers that do not comply with the current code. There was a consensus of the committee that 'non-compliant' should be removed from the sentence.

- Don Warren does not agree that lawn should be prohibited within shoreline buffers. He stated that grass acts as a filter for sediment and chemicals. Cyrilla Cook disagreed and commented that while lawn is only beneficial for erosion purposes. Lee Moyer commented that lawns do not provide much of a beneficial habitat for shorelines and they are basically a sterile environment. David Johanson pointed out that this regulation is only for new lawns, not existing lawns and Bob Fritzen commented that lawns do not provide a proper buffer, having a plant a native community provides an essential habitat for creatures that live near the shoreline.
 - Bob Fritzen suggested in 2.c.ix, to remove 'non-conforming' from the regulation. The committee discussed the revision and came to the consensus that 2.c.ix should be removed from the SMP because it can be found elsewhere in the document.
2. **20.30.050 Dimensional Standards for Shoreline Development**
- David Johanson gave an overview of Figure 5 Dimensional Standards for Shoreline Development. Pat Haugen asked if any of the buffers apply to community beaches.
3. **20.30.055 Shoreline Buffers**
- Lee Moyer suggested the language be added to explain show shoreline buffers are measured, such as perpendicular from the OHWM (ordinary high water mark). There were no objections to including a measurement method section to clarify the buffer dimensions.
4. **20.30.060 Shoreline Uses**
- Pat Haugen asked if the term "Recreation" in this section included community beaches. Cyrilla Cook suggested that all uses should be included in the uses and modifications list. Karen Stewart responded that community beaches are not listed in this section because there are no regulations within the section that address community beaches. Karen asked the committee if the committee would like all uses to be added to the list.
 - Bob Fritzen asked if the committee feels boat ramps should fall under the non-conforming code, or should the SMP provide regulations for maintenance. The committee reached a consensus that there should be no changes to the code regarding boat ramps with the exception of footnote 2 in 20.30.001 Figure 4.
 - The committee went on to discuss various types of boat ramps such as paved vs. track ramps. Bob Fritzen stated that whether the boat ramp is upland or in-water, impact occur in both places that will affect the shoreline.

- Lee Moyer asked if a new boat ramp could be allowed if impacts to the shoreline are mitigated to produce no net loss. Mitigation could include removing the bulkhead and re-vegetating the shoreline. Cyrilla Cook suggested a provision be added to the SMP that ramps may be installed if there is no net loss to the shoreline. The committee reached a consensus to not alter the code.

5. **20.30.065 Aquaculture**

- Don Warren asked if aquaculture is allowed in Lake Burien. Staff responded that it was, but at this time, none exists. Karen Stewart suggested that Lake Burien be added to footnote 1 in 20.30.001 Figure 4. There was consensus to add the footnote that would prohibit aquaculture in the lake.
- A suggestion and consensus to revise the definition of aquaculture to include language to include an exception for education and research.

6. **20.30.070 Bulkheads and Other Shoreline Stabilization Structures**

- Cyrilla Cook commented that there is no policy background to support the regulations for non-structural bulkheads. She has proposed to add 3 more policy statements to provide a basis for the city's objective of protecting shoreline functions from structural shoreline stabilization. The committee reached a consensus to add the following policy language:
 - c. Burien should take active measures to preserve natural unaltered shorelines, and prevent the proliferation of bulkheads and other forms of shoreline armoring.*
 - d. Non-structural stabilization measures including relocating structures, increasing buffers, enhancing vegetation, managing drainage and runoff and other measures are preferred over structural shoreline armoring.*
 - e. Where feasible, any failing, harmful, unnecessary, or ineffective structural shoreline armoring should be removed, and shoreline ecological functions and processes should be restored using non-structural methods.*
- Pat Haugen asked where the one foot requirement in 2.i. came from. Staff responded that it was taken from a current regulation in the existing SMP.
- Lee Moyer asked what 'extreme high water' means and how it is determined.
- Staff responded that they would look into both questions.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, CHAPTER V: Committee did not have time to discuss Chapter V at this meeting.

(7) NEXT STEPS AND NEXT MEETING:

1. Another meeting for further discussion has been scheduled for October 21, 2009, in the same location and at the same time.
2. David Johanson encouraged the committee members to submit their comments before the next meeting. Comments should be submitted by 5pm, 10/12.

The meeting concluded at 6:00pm.